Rhodora

JOURNAL OF

THE NEW ENGLAND BOTANICAL CLUB

Vol. 57 March, 1955 No. 675

A NOTE ON THE NAME CALAMINTHA

GORDON P. DEWOLF, JR.

THE genus *Satureja*, L. as interpreted in the 8th edition of "Gray's Manual of Botany" includes plants that have been included in four genera: SATUREJA (*S. hortensis* L.); CALAMINTHA (*S. Calamintha*, (L.) Scheele = *C. officinalis* Moench; *S. glabella* (Michx.) Briq. = *C. glabella* (Michx.) Benth.; *S. arkansana* (Nutt.) Briq. = *C. glabella* (Michx.) Benth., var. *angustifolia* (Torr.) DeWolf [*Satureja glabella* (Michx.) Briq., var. *angustifolia* (Torr.) Svenson]; ACINOS (*S. Acinos* (L.) Scheele = *A. arvensis* (Lam.) Dandy; and CLINOPODIUM (*S. vulgare* (L.) Fritsch = *C. vulgare* L.).

Study of material of species of this group known to be in cultivation has convinced me that these four taxa are not congeneric, and that current European practice of recognizing them as distinct genera should be followed. A fuller discussion of the taxonomic aspects of the problem has been published elsewhere (Baileya 2(4): 142–150. 1954 [Jan., 1955]). Here I should like to discuss a purely nomenclatural problem.

In the 52nd volume of Fedde's "Repertorium specierum novarum regni vegetabilis," Heft 2, pp. 144–161, 1943, there appears the second of a series of articles by Erwin Janchen entitled "Zur Nomenclature der Gattungsnamen." My attention was drawn to this paper by the inclusion in the 1952 edition of the "International Code of Botanical Nomenclature," p. 131, of the name *Calamintha*, Lamarck as a *nomen conservandum proposition*, the respective *nomen propositum rejiciendum* being *Clinopodium*, Linnaeus. It seems to me that certain data have been overlooked in the framing of this proposal, and hence, further, and perhaps fuller, discussion is in order.

In the 1943 paper, p. 156, no. 7305, Janchen refers to a paper by Janchen and Neumayer, entitled "Beiträge zur Benennung, Bewertung und Verbreitung der Farn- und Blütenpflanzen Deutschlands" in the "Oesterreichische Botanische Zeitschrift," volume 91, 1942, pp. 209–298, in particular to p. 274. At this place the identity of *Calamintha*, Moench (1794) [non Lamarck! 1778] and *Clinopodium*, Linnaeus is asserted, and their distinctness from *Satureja*, Linnaeus is affirmed. Further, Janchen and Neumayer stated: ". . . Mit Rücksicht auf die Artenanzahl ist *Calamintha* gegenüber dem älteren Gattungsnamen *Clinopodium* auf der Ausnahmsliste zu schützen . . ." They also refer to a paper in the "Acta Horti Gotoburgensis," volume 13, 1939, pp. 335–380, in particular p. 349, in which essentially the same thought is expressed by Handel-Mazzetti.

Objections to this proposal arise on two points:

1. *Calamintha*, Lamarck (1778) is a later homonym of *Calamintha*, Miller (1754) *Calamintha*, Trew (1754) and *Calamintha*, Adanson (1763) (and/or Scopoli, 1772), and is synonymous with *Calamintha*, Miller and *Calamintha*, Trew.
2. *Calamintha*, whether of Miller, Trew, Adanson, Scopoli, Lamarck, or Moench, did not contain any species then ascribed to *Clinopodium*. The two taxa were not confused until 1891 when O. Kuntze reduced *Calamintha*, Moench emend. Bentham to *Clinopodium*, Linnaeus emend. O. Kuntze.

Reference to Pfeiffer's "Nomenclator Botanicus," volume 1, part 1, of 1873 indicates that *Calamintha* was first used as a post-Linnaean name by Adanson, in the "Families des Plantes" of 1763, volume 2, p. 192, for the Linnaean genus *Glechoma*. This same usage was maintained by Scopoli in the first volume of the second edition of the "Flora Carniolica" (1772), at p. 423, where synonymy and a good description of the single species [*Glechoma hederacea*] are given. The next entry should be to the usage of Lamarck in the second volume of the first edition of the "Flore Francoise," 1778, p. 393, no. 432. Pfeiffer missed this, however, so the next actual entry is to Moench's "Methodus Plantas . . ." of 1794.

A note about *Calamintha*, Moench is perhaps in order. In 1794 the "Methodus Plantas Horti Botanici et Agri Marburgensis, a Staminum Situ Describendi" of Konrad Moench was published. In this work, at least so far as the labiates are

concerned, very good generic and specific diagnoses are given. It was used by Bentham during the preparation of his "Labiatarum, Genera et Species," of 1832–36, and, in particular, Bentham accepted Moench's circumscription of *Calamintha* over that of Lamarck. As published by Moench, three species were accepted: *C. grandiflora*, (L.) Moench; *C. officinalis*, Moench; and *C. trichotoma*, Moench = *C. Nepeta*, (L.) Savi.

Meanwhile, *Clinopodium* had received a very uniform treatment. In 1753 Linnaeus included three species in his genus, viz., *Clinopodium vulgare; C. incanum* = *Pycnanthemum incanum*, (L.) Michx., fide Bentham, "Labiatarum . . ." p. 327; and *C. rugosum* = *Hyptis capitata*, Jacquin (ex Jamaica) and *H. radiata*, Willdenow (ex Carolina), fide Bentham, "Labiatarum . . ." pp. 104 and 108. Of these three species, *Clinopodium vulgare* has been consistently retained in the genus since its publication, and its immediate relatives have been placed with it.

In 1754 Philip Miller published a three volume, octavo, abridgement of the last folio edition (? 6th, 1752) of "The Gardeners Dictionary." In this work binomial nomenclature was not used, but the generic descriptions are well drawn[1]. We are, therefore, faced with the necessity of considering Miller's genera. We find that Miller defined a genus he called "*Calamintha.*" The generic circumscription is tolerably specific, and, of the six taxa listed, the first three are the same as those accepted by Moench. They are: *Calamintha vulgaris, vel officinarum Germanicae*, of Caspar Bauhin = *C. officinalis*, Moench; *Calamintha pulegii odore, foliis latioribus*, of Paul Hermann = *C. Nepeta*, (L.) Savi; and the *Calamintha magno flore*, of Caspar Bauhin = *C. grandiflora*, (L.) Moench.

When I discussed the taxonomic aspects of this problem in Baileya (l.c.) the name *Calamintha* was ascribed to Philip Miller. This occurred because of ignorance of the fact that also in 1754 Christopher Jacob Trew, in his Nuremburg edition of Elizabeth Blackwell's "A Curious Herbal," which is usually referred to as the "Herbarium Blackwellianum," had used the name *Calamintha.* Trew validated his name by reference to the generic descriptions of pre-Linnaean authors, including Ray and Tourne-

[1] After Tournefort, *fide* G. C. Druce in Rpt. Botanical Exchange Club of the British Isles **3**: 426–428, 1913.

fort. Further he gave two excellent plates: no. 166, *Calamintha montana* = *C. officinalis*, Moench and no. 167, *Calamintha officinalis* = *C. Nepeta*, (L.) Savi.

In the past there has been a good deal of discussion as to the advisability of rejecting all names published in works dated after 1753 which do not use binomial nomenclature. As late as 1935 a formal proposal[2] was made to the 6th International Botanical Congress that such be done, and a list of proscribed works be made. This seems, however, to have met with no success.[3] We are left, then, with the tacit understanding that generic names, so long as validly and legitimately published after 1753, may be taken up even from works not using binomial nomenclature.

In the present case we are concerned with homonymous and/or synonymous names, published in the same year, but in unknown sequence. It behooves us, then, to take up for purposes of nomenclature, the most adequately circumscribed of the two names. Miller provides a generic description in English, and cited, with description, also in English, six species. Trew gave no generic description as such, but validated his name implicitly by reference to previously effectively published generic descriptions, especially those of Ray and Tournefort. Trew also gave two excellent plates of the two species which he accepted and full specific descriptions in Latin and German. Therefore, for purposes of citation I am accepting *Calamintha*, Trew.

Lamarck's circumscription of *Calamintha* on the other hand, is not good, nor does he refer to descriptions by previous authors. The genus may be identified with certainty only by recourse to the included species. Of these, the first two, *C. alpina* and *C. arvensis*, are now placed in *Acinos; C. cretica* is referred to *Micromeria;* and only the last two, *C. parviflora* and *C. montana* are now retained, under earlier names, in *Calamintha* (*C. Nepeta*, (L.) Savi and *C. officinalis*, respectively, fide Bentham "Labiatarum . . ." p. 387–388).

Until the publication of O. Kuntze (Revisio Generum Plantarum, volume 2, pp. 513–516) in 1891, there was little confusion of the two taxa which may be distinguished taxonomically as follows:

[2] Wilmott, A. J.—Kew Bull. *1935* 66.
[3] Little, E. L.—Madrono *7:* 240–242, 1944.

Calamintha	*Clinopodium*
Calyx tubular, straight. Verticellasters on relatively long pedicels, sub-secund.	Calyx tubular, curved. Verticellasters sessile or nearly so.

After the genera were firmly established, with good circumscriptions, by Moench in 1794, in the "Methodus Plantas . . .," they were generally treated as taxa of correlative rank. Bentham treated them as sections of *Melissa*, L. in the "Labiatarum . . ." of 1832–36, and as sections of *Calamintha*, Moench emend. Bentham in the 12th volume of de Candolle's "Prodromus Systematis Naturalis . . ." of 1848. Briquet, in IV Teil, 3 Abteilung, a, of" Die natürlichen Pflanzenfamilien" of 1897, treated them as sections of *Satureja*, L. Neither Bentham nor Briquet considered them synonymous, as did O. Kuntze and Janchen and Neumayer.

Two facts emerge from this discussion. In the first place, *Calamintha* and *Clinopodium*, as originally proposed, and as generally used to 1891, apparently had no species in common. There was, and is today, controversy over the rank of the taxa, but not over their identity or composition. In the second place, the proposal by Janchen is to conserve a poorly circumscribed later name over an adequately circumscribed Linnaean name. Further, the name proposed for conservation is both a later homonym and synonym of earlier names, facts not mentioned by the propositor.

The "International Code of Botanical Nomenclature" (1952), at Article 24, stated: ". . . These names [for conservation] are preferably such as have come into general use in the fifty years following their publication, or which have been used in monographs and important floristic works up to the year 1890 . . ." Up to the year 1890 both *Calamintha*, Moench (non Lamarck) and *Clinopodium*, Linnaeus were in general use for the respective taxa concerned. There was no confusion between them.

Finally, if *Clinopodium*, Linnaeus is declared a *nomen rejiciendum*, those who desire to recognize the taxon which has borne that name as a genus will be faced with the necessity of publishing a new name for it.

For these reasons it is recommended that the proposal for the

conservation of the name *Calamintha*, Lamarck, and the rejection of the name *Clinopodium*, Linnaeus not receive favorable action.—BAILEY HORTORIUM, CORNELL UNIVERSITY, ITHACA.

A REVISION OF THE NORTH AMERICAN GENUS SABATIA (GENTIANACEAE)

ROBERT L. WILBUR

(*Continued from page 71*)

E. Subsection DODECANDRAE subsect. nov.[5]

Subg. *Plurimaria* Raf., Med. Fl. **2:** 76. 1830, in part, not *Plurimaria* Raf. (as genus), Fl. Tell. **3:** 31. 1837.

Pleienta Raf., Fl. Tell. **3:** 30. 1837, in part, an illegitimate name since its type, designated by Rafinesque, is the same as that of *Sabatia*.

Sect. *Pleienta* (Raf.) Blake, RHODORA **17:** 56. 1915, an illegitimate name.

Dodecandrae Small, Man. SE. Fl. 1049. 1933, a category of undesignated status.

Rhizomatose perennials with at least the secondary and very often the primary branches alternate. Strongly pronounced tendency towards plurimerous flowers ranging from 5–12(–14)-parted. Flowers typically large and pedicels usually longer than 1 cm. TYPE SPECIES: *Sabatia dodecandra* (L.) BSP.

This subsection contains but four species which, except for one species, are restricted to the Coastal Plain of the United States. *S. calycina* occurs in addition on at least two islands of the West Indies.

S. calycina, I feel certain, has very little in common with the species of subsection *Campanulatae* with which it has been formerly associated. Its proper relationship is more aptly shown by grouping it with the rhizomatose, pluripetalous species of the *dodecandra*-alliance. The strongly pronounced tendency for this species to possess flower-parts more numerous than five, the large, often foliose calyx-lobes, the often conspicuous, elongate rhizome, the broad leaves and the broadly campanulate calyx-tube are features of all or most of the *dodecandra*-group

[5] Subsectio Dodecandrae. Perennes rhizomatibus praeditae. Rami secondarii et interdum primarii alterni. Flores saepe plurimeres, inter 5-partiti et 14-partiti, plerumque in specie una 5–6-partiti, in speciebus aliis ca. 9- partiti, typice grandes, pedicellis quam 1 cm. longioribus. Species typica, Sabatia dodecandra (L.) BSP. (Chironia dodecandra L.)